



Docket No.: 1349.1147

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Karp-sik YOUN

Serial No. 10/608,183

Group Art Unit: 2853

Confirmation No. 8787

Filed: June 30, 2003

Examiner: Huffman, Julian D.

For: APPARATUS TO CONTROL STATIC ELECTRICITY IN AN INK-JET PRINTER

COMMENTS REGARDING STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Statements of Reasons for Allowance were forwarded in the Actions mailed August 29, 2005, February 24, 2005 and October 5, 2004.

MPEP §1302.14 states, in part:

Where specific reasons are recorded by the examiner, care must be taken to ensure that statements of reasons for allowance (or indication of allowable subject matter) are accurate, precise and do not place unwarranted interpretations, whether broad or narrow upon the claims. The examiner should keep in mind the possible misinterpretations of his or her statement that may be made and its possible estoppel effects.

The Examiner characterizes certain features of various claims. However, the Examiner has not recited the appropriate language for the appropriate claims as pending and allowed in the application. By way of example, the Reasons in the August 29, 2005 Action with respect to claim 1 refer to a "ground member torsion spring." It is noted that claim 1 does not recite a "ground member torsion spring." Instead, claim 1 recites that the ground member is a torsion spring.

The foregoing is merely meant to be exemplary, and does not point out all of the discrepancies between the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance and the claimed features of the currently pending claims.

Also, it is submitted that the Examiner's reference to only portions of the claims in the reasons for allowance is improper in that it provides certain emphasis which might "place unwarranted interpretations, whether broad or narrow, upon the claims" (M.P.E.P. §1302.14).


It is further submitted that the claims speak for themselves and should not be interpreted based on the Examiner's characterizations of same. It is also submitted that the claims provide their own best evidence as to the reasons for allowance.

In summary, it is submitted that the Examiner's Statement "raises possible misinterpretations... and possible estoppel effects" (M.P.E.P. §1302.14) and is therefore improper.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 3-17-06

By: 
Michael J. Badagliacca
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501